

physics, it misses the point of Applicant's argument, which is that the present invention uses the presence of a wheel slippage to activate the arrangement for reducing the braking force. Whether a wheel slippage is present during a rollover is not the same issue as whether a vehicle apparatus uses such a slippage to activate a braking force reduction arrangement. Indeed, one may argue that the '463 rejects the use of a wheel slippage as the basis to activate its brake reduction operation. Specifically, at page 7, lines 8-12, of the translation of this reference, which was supplied with the prior Amendment, the reference states the following: "When an antilock brake system is installed, vehicle reference speed  $V_x$  is available in any case for ascertaining wheel slippage, so that only differentiation of the reference speed, which is numerically easily executed, has to be carried out to obtain vehicle deceleration." According to this quoted statement, the system of the '463 reference is not interested, nor does it use, any signal representing a detection of wheel slippage; instead, the system of the '463 reference is interested only in the detected vehicle speed that the antilock brake system uses to detect wheel slippage. The system of the '463 reference uses the vehicle speed detected by the antilock brake system to calculate vehicle deceleration. The system of the '463 reference then determines the extent to which this deceleration deviates from a reference deceleration; on the basis of this deviation is the braking force reduction of the '463 reference performed. As the Examiner can appreciate, the system of the '463 reference reduces the braking force according to this deviation, and not as a function of the wheel slippage that was available to it through the antilock brake system that is also on board the vehicle of the '463 reference. Indeed, one could even characterize this reference as teaching away from the use of wheel slippage to activate a braking force reduction arrangement because the inventors were aware of the ability of the antilock brake system to detect wheel slippage, yet chose not to use this particular output of the antilock brake system in its rollover protection system. Thus, in view of this discussion, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 12 is respectfully requested.

As for the other claims, all of which depend from either claims 1 or 12 and have been rejected based on the '463 reference based on either anticipation or obviousness, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable for at least the reasons given above.


It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of the present application is new, non-obvious, and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12/18/03

By: 

Richard L. Mayer  
Reg. No. 22,490

By:   
B16 38, 252

KENYON & KENYON  
One Broadway  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 425-7200